

Student's Name
Professor's Name
Course
Date



USE OF CELL PHONES: Annotated Bibliography



Tentative Thesis: Although the use of cell phones is forbidden during the classes, the students should be still allowed to use them due to the personal right and identity.

Auter, Philip J. 'Portable Social Groups: Willingness to Communicate, Interpersonal Communication Gratifications, and Cell Phone Use among Young Adults.' *International Journal of Mobile Communications* 5.2 (2007): 139-156. Print.

The article is focused on adult cell phone usage among 182 students at Southern University. The survey conducted revealed that the participants used their cell phones about 10.5 hours per week. The majority of the respondents explained that this use was confined to the traditional calling. The results of the study have also revealed the positive correlation between improving interpersonal communication and cell phone usage. The major claim is supported with the theoretical



grounds related to the communication theory, which is also appropriate for the given research. Communication skills create a part of personal identity, which should not be distorted by violations and inspections provided by the teachers.

The article introduces the empirical evidence that the cell phone use has positive implications for improving students' communication skills as well as the level of understanding. Moreover, the average use of cell phones during the day does not exceed 2 hours. Therefore, in case the teachers are not suspicious, they should have a neutral attitude to the use of cell phones during the classes. Instead, they could be more concerned with the level of students' engagement into the course. In fact, communication via phone is not conducted during the classes. Instead, the students are involved in the instant messages, which do not prevent teachers from introducing the objectives of the lesson. In addition, the author focuses on the fact that communication could be also important, and the teachers should have respect for the student's privacy because there could be many reasons for using cell phone during the classes.

There should not be any relation between cell phone use and the student's achievement, which means that some of the teachers start checking students without objective and preliminary evaluation of the context. The analysis of cell phone use in this respect has a different angle of debate, but it still proves that the use of mobile devices should be allowed to students. Furthermore, the restricted use of cell phone can have a negative influence on students' communication skills as well

as on their willingness to communicate.

The author of the article, Philip Auter, studies internet design and communication theories, which contributes to the article's credibility and reliability. The source could be used as an underpinning argument for the future research because it covers positive sides of the cell phone use for educational and social purposes. The communication theory approves the use of mobile devices because they contribute to greater interaction and active socialization, which also fosters information exchange. Although the author does not refer to the Constitutional rights, the evidence is sufficient for understanding the value of using mobile devices for educational purposes.

Cooke, Sean. 'Reasonable Suspicion, Unreasonable Search: Defining Fourth Amendment Protections Against Searches of Students' Personal Electronic Devices by Public School Officials.' *HeinOnline*, 293 (2012)1. Print.

The article bears a legal ground while defining and justifying the legal phone use among the students. Specifically, the scholar explains that recent advances in digital technologies in the field of electronic tools have undermined the current status of the Fourth Amendment, when applied to a school setting. The Supreme Court recent discussion of the case mentioned in another article, namely *Safford Unified School District No 1 v. Redding*, introduces a framework to protect and define students' privacy rights excluded for the purpose of the search under

reasonable suspicion standard, which was established in another case called *New Jersey v. T. L. O.* In order to investigate the issue deeper, the case has specific reasons for the educators to conduct a warranted search based on the serious suspicion that two girls were smoking in the bathroom. However, the case shows that the girls violated the discipline and order in the school. The assumption that she had cigarettes in her purse was reasonable, which also justified the vice-principal's suspicion. This situation, however, is just the proof that all the searches should be justified before they are conducted. In the majority of cases, administrators are guided by the assumption that the students should obey the school rules and adhere to the school discipline. However, silent messaging does not violate the discipline. In response, there should be alternative measures that would strike the balance between these two extremes.

Interestingly, the student's protection of public school officials, according to the doctrine of immunity, threatens student protection due to the unreasonable searches of personal mobile devices. At the same time, by defining and introducing students' privacy interests in the mobile devices as worthy of protection, the courts can still enforce educational establishment to respond, according to these nuances in the certain contexts. In particular, the courts can ratify schools to resort to reasonable search in case of danger and disruption without reference to the student's privacy.

The author introduces a helpful and relevant background supporting the application of the Fourth Amendment in relation to the students'

searches for their privacy issues. Nonetheless, these searchers are non-authorized in the majority of cases due to the lack of grounds for the search. Educators, therefore, should be more aware and knowledgeable of the laws and regulations that protect student's private life and privacy rights. There is also an important investigation being presented in the article. In particular, the author provides a detailed account of the teacher's false assumptions regarding the veritable reasons for the students to use cell phones. Specifically, they believe that confiscating mobile devices could not be an abuse of student's personal rights because some of them do not use cell phones for these purposes. However, this fallacy leads to miscommunication and ignorance of the fact that students actually use these devices for privacy purposes although they can often post personal information online via mobile/cell phones.

The article introduces a variety of justifications and legal evidence for believing that unauthorized and warrantless search for the cell phone should be prohibited based on the Fourth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. Therefore, the article itself can expand on the topic and contribute to the credibility and validity of the research. Additionally, it also provides many examples that explain the conditions for educators to conduct warranted search and avoid violations against students' personal rights.

Pachler, Nobert, Ben Bachmair, and John Cook. *Mobile Learning: Structures, Agency, Practices*. New York, NY: Springer Science & Media,

2009. Print.

The authors of the book focus on the use of mobile technology in general and the use of devices at school. Specifically, a detailed account is made on the use of mobile/cell phones at schools and educational establishment to define that this device could make contributions to a learning process. In the book, the authors assume, "educationists should provide background information and structures, which would allow young people to find ways to express their interest and attitudes by using different media and modes on different platforms" (Pachler, Bachmair and Cook 148). In this respect, the media convergence could become the major issue of using data from mobile cell phones for the personal education as well as to be socially engaged and active. Teachers and instructors should also encourage students to use cell phones for practical reasons. In such a way, a compromise could be found between teachers' negative attitude to cell phones and student's obsession with cell phone use during classes for irrelevant purposes.

The book contains the discussion from different angles and viewpoints. Moreover, the analysis of privacy concerns is also presented in the source. Specifically, the author explains that the emergence of digital media platforms creates new challenges to the protection and security of privacy. The risk to privacy is also associated with the use of cell phones. Specifically, the device contains much private and confidential information, which is extremely personalized and, therefore, the necessity of keeping this information secure is indispensable (Pachler et al., 89). Consequently, the students should also rely on this reason while

rejecting teachers to confiscate their phones because it does violate their privacy rights. Specifically, the author also explains that allowing students to use mobile tools during the learning process can motivate them to be more enthusiastic during the learning process. It can also solve the problem of cultural differences.

The authors also provide a detailed and justified explanation for the prevention and prohibition on the use of mobile phones. Specifically, the analysis introduces new approaches to the management. In particular, Pachler et al explain, "the discourse about inappropriate use of mobile/cell phones was one of the early motivations for the discursive and productive process of integration of mobile/cell phones in curricular activities – starting with using the mobile/cell phone as topic, i.e. to critically reflect on opportunities and risks" (150). In such a way, some teachers should engage in these discourses with the social contexts in order to understand how mobile devices could improve the situation. For example, cell phones could be used as calculation devices and reflect their own attitude to the use of cell phones from the viewpoint of a consumer behavior.

The above information shows that the book is a helpful guide introducing the nature of mobile learning and media as well as demonstrating how mobile devices could be reconsidered in an educational setting to strike the balance between teacher's disagreement regarding the cell phone use and protection of students' personal rights. The resource is helpful because it introduces the basis for further research in the respective field. Moreover, it can serve as a

strong standpoint in the debate regarding the issue.

Vorenberg, Amy. "Indecent Exposure: Do Warrantless Searches of a Student's Cell Phone Violate the Fourth Amendment?" *Beckerley Journal of Criminal Law* 17.1 (2009): 62-96. Print.

In the article, the scholar argues, "school administrator searches of a student's cell phone should require a warrant, unless there are urgent circumstances involving safety" (Vorenberg 64). The assumption corresponds to the main argument of the bibliography that will further be used in the research because the author support the idea of allowing students to use cell phones in compliance with their privacy right. The administrators should adhere to the constitutional rules, which imply that they are not allowed to conduct warrantless searches because they violate the Fourth Amendment of the Constitution. Given the fact that the cell phones do not pose any overt danger and contain private data, the school officials should gain permission before they can confiscate mobile devises.

In order to provide evidence for the argument presented in the article, the author introduces theoretical information about the Fourth Amendment and its relation to the school context. Specifically, the author insists that the students should be protected from warrantless searches because the reason for these inspections is not justified in the majority of cases. Instead, school teachers and administrators can conduct the inspections only for pocketbooks, backpacks and other

issues of personal property with a certain degree of suspicion. Specifically, the searches should not concern private things that disclose personal identity or private life.

In order to enhance the argument, the author refers to other concepts and theories. The scholar has introduced a number of case studies, in which the use of cell phones during classes was both approved and disapproved. However, the choice of cases introduces exceptions and specific context, in which these inspections are allowed. In particular, the author concludes, "whether a search is based on individualized or generalized suspicion, it is always evaluated within the unique context of a student's privacy interests and the school's need to maintain order and discipline, along with a school's responsibility for the safety of its students" (Vorenberg 70). The inspections, therefore, should not be conducted on administrator's personal and unjustified initiative.

One of the brightest examples presented in the article refers to the case study called *Safford United School District v. Redding*. Specifically, the court has expressed doubts regarding the rational for accusing students of hiding Ibuprofen. The student was also accused of distributing the drugs to other students, which made teachers and administrator search the open pants and bra although there were no pills detected. The court stated that the scope of the search was not reasonable due to the inappropriateness of the circumstances and contexts. Additionally, there was no direct evidence proving that the student was involved in drug distribution. In general, the case shows that administrators were subjective in their attempt to chase students

on the unreasonable ground.

The presence of valuable assumption and solid evidence makes the source appropriate for considering and expanding it in the research under analysis. There are many credible references in the article, which could justify the thesis and provide a ground for further analysis and evaluation. Additionally, the research introduces a valuable theoretical and empirical ground with multiple examples proving the inadequate policy regarding the prohibition of cell phones. More importantly, the paper introduces legal underpinnings enhancing the right of the student to use cell phones during the classes. The source also contains multiple cases to legal regulations and case studies, which provides stronger evidence.

